

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA AT HYDERABAD

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE N.TUKARAMJI

CRIMINAL PETITION No.8340 OF 2026

DATE : 18.06.2026

Between:

Betikunti Bhargav.

...Petitioner-accused No.3

AND

The State of Telangana.

...Respondent

ORDER:

This Criminal Petition is filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short, "BNSS"), seeking grant of anticipatory bail.

2. The petitioner is arrayed as Accused No.4 in Crime No.136 of 2026 on the file of the Mahabubnagar I Town Police Station, Mahabubnagar, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 307, 324, 498-A of Indian Penal Code and Sections 3 and 4 of Dowry Prohibition Act.

3. Heard Mr.Vijay Prashanth, learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr.Vivekananda Reddy, learned Additional Public Prosecutor representing the respondent-State and Mr.Manchoju Narsimha Chary, learned counsel representing the de facto complainant.

4.1. The prosecution case, in brief, is that the de facto complainant is the legally wedded wife of the petitioner. It is alleged that, at the time of

marriage, certain amounts and articles were given by her family. Subsequently, matrimonial discord arose between the spouses, and it is alleged that the petitioner and his parents, who are arrayed as accused Nos.1 and 2, subjected the de facto complainant to physical and mental cruelty with a view to coercing her and her family to meet unlawful demands for additional dowry.

4.2. The de facto complainant further alleges that, in the course of such matrimonial disputes, the petitioner made attempts to cause harm to her by allegedly applying some substance to her hair dryer, placing perfume on her toothbrush, and causing injuries to her private parts. It is stated that owing to the continuous harassment and apprehension for her safety, the de facto complainant left the matrimonial home on 30.07.2025 and has since been residing with her parents. Though efforts were allegedly made by elders and well-wishers to reconcile the parties, such attempts did not yield any positive result, leading to the lodging of the present complaint and registration of the subject crime.

5.1. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the allegations levelled against the petitioner are false, exaggerated and have been made with an oblique motive to harass not only the petitioner but also his aged parents. It is contended that the marriage between the petitioner and the de facto complainant was never consummated and that matrimonial disputes had already culminated in the institution of divorce proceedings by the petitioner. According to the learned counsel, the present

complaint has been lodged as a counterblast to the said matrimonial proceedings.

5.2. It is further submitted that the incidents referred to in the complaint pertain to the period between the years 2024 and 2025, whereas the de facto complainant admittedly left the matrimonial home on 30.07.2025 and lodged the complaint only in May, 2026, after a considerable lapse of time. Learned counsel contends that the complaint does not disclose the specific dates, places, or attendant circumstances relating to the alleged acts attributed to the petitioner. It is also argued that the allegations purportedly constituting an attempt to commit murder are vague in nature and, prima facie, do not disclose the essential ingredients necessary to attract such an offence. Nevertheless, learned counsel submits that the petitioner is willing to cooperate with the investigation, to appear before the Investigating Officer whenever required, and to abide by any condition that may be imposed by this Court. It is further brought to the notice of this Court that accused Nos.1 and 2, namely the parents of the petitioner, have already been granted anticipatory bail by the learned jurisdictional Court. On the aforesaid grounds, learned counsel seeks grant of anticipatory bail.

6. Per contra, learned Additional Public Prosecutor opposed the petition contending that the complaint contains serious and specific allegations against the petitioner, including allegations suggesting deliberate acts intended to endanger the life and bodily integrity of the de facto complainant. It is submitted that the investigation is still in progress and that the allegations attributed to the petitioner require thorough

examination. He further submits that the learned Sessions Court, upon considering the gravity of the allegations and the material available at that stage, had declined to grant anticipatory bail and, in the absence of any substantial change in circumstances, the present petition does not warrant interference. Accordingly, dismissal of the petition is sought.

7. Learned counsel appearing for the de facto complainant would submit that the complaint narrates in detail the incidents of cruelty and harassment allegedly perpetrated by the petitioner and specifically attributes to him acts intended to cause physical harm to the de facto complainant. It is contended that material supporting such allegations are there and that the petitioner has not been extending adequate cooperation to the investigation. It is further argued that grant of anticipatory bail at this stage may adversely affect the progress of the investigation and cause prejudice to the prosecution as well as to the interests of the de facto complainant. Therefore, dismissal of the petition is sought.

8. I have carefully considered the rival submissions and perused the material available on record.

9. The petitioner asserts that the allegations are devoid of substance and have been levelled in the backdrop of matrimonial discord and pending matrimonial proceedings between the parties. At the same time, the complaint contains allegations attributing certain acts to the petitioner, which, if ultimately established in accordance with law, may have serious consequences. The veracity, credibility, and evidentiary value of such

allegations are matters that necessarily require a comprehensive investigation and cannot be conclusively adjudicated at the stage of considering an application for anticipatory bail.

10. However, it is equally well settled that while deciding a petition for anticipatory bail, the Court is not expected to undertake a meticulous examination of the evidence or conduct a mini trial. The Court is required to examine whether custodial interrogation is genuinely necessary, the nature and gravity of the accusation, the antecedents of the accused, the possibility of absconding, and the likelihood of tampering with evidence or influencing witnesses.

11. In *Gurbaksh Singh Sibbia v. State of Punjab*, (1980) 2 SCC 565, the Constitution Bench of the Hon'ble Supreme Court held that anticipatory bail is a significant safeguard intended to protect personal liberty against arbitrary arrest and that the discretion to grant such relief must be exercised having regard to the peculiar facts and circumstances of each case. In *Sushila Aggarwal v. State (NCT of Delhi)*, (2020) 5 SCC 1, the Constitution Bench observed that while considering an application for anticipatory bail, the Court is required to strike a balance between the individual's right to liberty and the societal interest in ensuring a fair and effective investigation.

12. In the present case, having regard to the admitted delay in lodging the complaint, the existence of matrimonial disputes and pending proceedings between the parties, the grant of anticipatory bail to accused

Nos.1 and 2, and the absence of any material presently demonstrating that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is indispensable for the purposes of investigation, this Court is of the considered view that the interest of justice would be adequately safeguarded by extending the protection of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, subject to stringent conditions ensuring his participation in the investigation and preventing any interference with the course of justice.

13. Accordingly, the Criminal Petition is allowed. The petitioner/Accused No.3 shall be enlarged on anticipatory bail, subject to such terms and conditions to secure his presence during investigation.

(A) The petitioner-accused No.3 shall surrender before the Station House Officer, Mahabubnagar I Town, Mahabubnagar, on or before 03.07.2026. Upon such surrender or on arrest, the Station House Officer shall release the petitioner on bail on executing a personal bond for a sum of Rs.50,000/- (Rupees Fifty Thousand only) with two sureties for a like sum each, to the satisfaction of the said officer.

(B) The petitioner shall appear before the Investigating Officer every Tuesday between 09:00 a.m. to 05:00 p.m. for a period of twelve (12) weeks from the date of his release on bail and shall cooperate with the investigation in all respects.

(C) The petitioner shall furnish his complete residential address, mobile number and other contact particulars to the Investigating Officer and shall promptly intimate any change therein.

(D) The petitioner shall not directly or indirectly induce, threaten, influence, or promise any person acquainted with the facts of the case, nor shall he tamper with prosecution evidence in any manner whatsoever.

(E) Any violation of the above conditions shall entail cancellation of bail in accordance with law.

14. Pending miscellaneous applications, if any, shall stand closed.

Date: 18.06.2026

mmr

N.TUKARAMJI, J

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE N.TUKARAMJI

CRIMINAL PETITION No.8340 OF 2026

DATE : 18.06.2026

mmr

